

## **California GIS Council Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, October 17, 2007, 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM  
California State University, Modoc Hall, Willow Room 1  
3020 State University Drive East, Sacramento, CA 95819

### **Members agencies in attendance:**

Resources Agency  
CA Department of Health Services  
Governor's Office of Homeland Security  
CA Chief Information Office  
CA Housing and Transportation  
US Fish and Wildlife  
US Bureau of Land Management  
US Geological Survey  
US Forest Service  
Southern CA Association of Governments (via phone)  
Sacramento Area Council of Governments RGC  
Central Coast Joint Data Committee  
Bay Area RGC  
Far North RGC (via phone)  
San Diego RGC (via phone)  
San Joaquin Valley RGC  
Education (via phone)

### **Handouts and Presentations**

Agenda  
NHD Stewardship Status Report  
Imagery Working Group Report  
2008 AWRA Conference Announcement  
2008 California GIS Conference Announcement  
California GIS Activities Status (NSGIC handout)  
GIS Certification powerpoint

### **I. Welcome Introduction**

Mike Byrne, CGC Chair, convened the meeting at 9:05 AM. Mike took a role call of members in attendance in person or on the phone because a quorum was needed for voting later in the meeting. The role call showed 17 member organizations represented and the quorum was reached.

All meeting attendees and conference call participants then introduced themselves. Craig Dalby with the National Park Service (NPS) inquired about NPS membership on the Council. It was agreed to follow this up later offline.

- **Announcements**

Huasha Lui, representing the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) announced that she will step down from the Council soon. She will be replaced by Demeritus \_\_\_\_\_.

Carol Ostergren said that the 2008 Cooperative Agreements Program (CAP) grant applications are now available online (see the Federal Geographic Data Committee website for more details: [www.fgdc.gov/grants/2008CAP/2008CAPschedule](http://www.fgdc.gov/grants/2008CAP/2008CAPschedule)). She listed the grant categories including a new one seeking private sector partnerships with federal agencies to improve service oriented architecture. CAP stewardship goals this year are focused on transportation and structures. Carol added that she may have other funds available for proposals outside the CAP categories. She is also looking for input from members on interest in standards workshops.

Mike announced that California will have a new Geographic Information Office (GIO) within the next 90 days, though no one is in the position now.

## **II. Governance Issues**

Mike said that certain Council leadership positions are up for elections every two years. He listed the current members of the Council's Steering Committee and noted that he has been serving as acting Chair. Two Council leadership roles are open for nominations: Chair and Vice-Chair. Nominations were opened and Mike was nominated for Chair and Joe Concannon nominated for Vice-Chair. Nominations were seconded and both candidates elected by voice vote.

## **III Framework Data**

The framework data discussion would take place as a roundtable with discussion on several themes. Working groups can address framework issues in more detail.

- **Hydrography**

Carol led the discussion on hydro. Currently, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is assessing its possible role as the statewide steward of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD). Gary Darling is leading this initiative and a strategic plan is in work. The San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) has agreed to be the associate steward for the Bay Area and is generating memorandums of understanding (MOU) with local entities that will assist it in data management. In southern California, the San Diego Geographic Information Source (SanGIS) is performing a similar role in their region.

USGS recently sponsored NHD tools workshops in San Diego and is now awaiting migration of the tools to ArcMap 9.2. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) has a program to densify the 1:24,000 NHD over their properties and the NHD handout shows the status. Additional information on stewardships is available on the NHD website ([nhd.usgs.gov](http://nhd.usgs.gov)). There may be an NHD track at the 2008 California GIS Conference next spring. Also, the American Water Resources Association (AWRA) conference next March is seeking hydro-related abstracts. USGS NHD workshops are available for groups interested in stewardship.

Gary noted that USGS partnership funds paid for the NHD study now underway at DWR. Brian Fulfroast asked about NHD Plus and data integration along the central coast. Carol said the regional water board is interested in this dataset. Paul Viesze asked about the difference between the 1:24,000 NHD and the densified product. The USFS products are adding new data to the original NHD. Mike suggested that hydro standards may need to be eventually addressed by a subcommittee.

- Imagery

Carol also led this discussion. The imagery work group released a Request for Proposals for state imagery business needs and best practices. A vendor was selected and the project will proceed over the next few months. Carol mentioned the National States Geographic Information Council's (NSGIC) Imagery for the Nation program and noted that one meter nationwide funds are being sought through the Farm Bill.

A question was asked on linking imagery supply and users and better demonstrating the need for imagery. Carol and Mike said NSGIC is a good venue to route support. Bruce Joffe suggested that we need to note both the dollar and application benefits of imagery. More discussion followed on the Farm Bill components and local/regional imager uses, benefits, and constituents.

Carol brought up imagery data management problems and the need to strategize. Gary suggested use of more loaner terabyte drives. Malcolm Adkins provided some background on the NSGIC Corporate Leadership Council.

- Mike showed a new map of 911 jurisdictional boundaries. He asked that regional groups in areas missing data contact Donna Pena. Phil Ogilby noted that NGA is also looking for these boundaries.

- Transportation

Oscar Jarquin led this discussion. He noted CalTrans' responsibility is to manage 15,000 miles of freeways, not the other 300,000+ miles of roads in the state. CalTrans recently purchased a TeleAtlas Dynamap license for statewide data. The data are available to all governmental entities but any public domain versions must use three year old data (with certain attributes stripped). Chuck Ramsey reiterated the data access conditions. California data access will be through CalTrans, not TeleAtlas, though data are not available yet (maybe by Christmas). Oscar pointed out the difference between absolute road segment alignment and the relative position of the roads to other TeleAtlas layers. There was a discussion regarding other features tied to roads like bridges and culverts. Oscar added that local groups can update and contribute data and this could be coordinated through a work group. He volunteered to lead the group, which will be started later via email.

Mike called a ten minute meeting break.

- Parcels

Oscar pointed out the Digital Land Records Information work group has not met in two years. The parcels data world is very volatile right now. Interest varies at local level with

some citing insufficient state support. He added that a for-fee private sector solution might be the answer. This led to questions on vendors and new state Master Services Agreement (MSA) categories (off the shelf data, web/image subscription services, data collection). The discussion moved to discussing the challenges of both obtaining parcel data from their local sources and accessing licensed data via a vendor. Jeff \_\_\_\_\_ pointed out that the Sacramento Area Council has spatial data but the hard part is getting attribution. Oscar observed that the parcels problem may be solving itself. Paul and Bruce noted open records requests and the need to know what is covered. Mike said the NorCal URISA chapter held a meeting on this. He recommended recalling the working group.

- **Critical infrastructure**

Terrence Newsom led this report. Several federal structures standards have been introduced and a more refined version, with 17 feature categories, is being used now. California state criteria were developed by \_\_\_\_\_ National Lab. Individual counties also develop their own criteria because they have structures not covered by federal or state standards. This is still a work in progress with no work group.

- **Vegetation**

Tom Lupo provided background on the two Legislative bills that funded and set responsibilities for a new statewide digital vegetation map. One bill provided \$4,000,000 this fiscal year and the second requires the California Department of Fish & Game to develop the standards. Tom recommended reconvening the vegetation MOU group. He cited the NSGIC handout for more info including URL link. Tom answered questions to report this program will conflate/ingest other data but that the vegetation map will not include agriculture or urban regions.

At the end of the framework discussion, Ray McDowell reminded everyone that the state may be able to purchase a color infrared version of the statewide National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) dataset but that additional funding partners are needed.

#### **IV. Council Topic on GIS Certification**

Dave Hansen and Geney Terry gave a presentation on professional certification through the GIS Certification Institute (GISCI). Certification as a GIS Professional (GISP) is based on one's education, work experience, and contributions to the field. All members must follow a code of ethics. There is a grandfather clause in effect for certification but this expires in December 2008.

They pointed out the differences between certification and licensing. California currently has 96 GISPs. Certain point scores are needed for both certification (52 points) and recertification (28 points to recertify every five years). To date, a number of organizations (including NACO and the states of NC, OR, NJ, and OH) endorse the GISP process. GISPs have four areas of obligation – to society, to employers, to colleagues, and to individuals. Dave listed some of the values of being certified (training, recognition, ethics, career paths, position descriptions, and helping identify candidates). Bruce cited a sample letter handout showing reasons to endorse certification. There were some questions on the value of certification since it's not required. Dave and Geney said that some jobs in other states (OR, TX) now require certification. A URISA salary survey also shows value. Alan Mikuni cited similar situations at the federal level

such as licensed photogrammetrists. Bruce brought up the general idea that better defining professional GIS roles can reduce confusion with other professions, such as surveying.

Mike asked whether there should be a motion to endorse certification. Malcolm wondered what the ramifications of endorsing this process are. Mike suggested we delay endorsement and view a draft letter at the next meeting. Dave Hansen will form a work group to consider the endorsement.

**V. Homeland Security Working Group**

Discussion was tabled in the interest of time.

**VI. Update from the NSGIC Annual Conference**

No discussion; NSGIC items handled in earlier topics.

**VII. Wrap up Discussion/Next Meeting**

Mike announced some topics for possible discussion at the next meeting will include DOI authoritative layers, MSA contracts, and service oriented architecture (SAO). A discussion on the CIO was suggested if time allows. The next 'virtual' meeting will be in January 2008. The next full meeting will be in conjunction at the GIS Conference in April. The meeting adjourned at 12:08.